Survey Question	WG Participant 1	WG Participant 2	WG Participant 3	WG Participant 4	WG Participant 5	WG Participant 6	WG Participant 7	WG Participant 8	WG Participant 9
Did the Round 1 workgroup meetings (August-September) provide adequate information to prepare you for your involvement in the process?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		No	Yes	No	Yes
What critical information (if any) was missing from the R1 workgroup presentations?		How to actually go about asking for ideas and comments from the constituents, and also what exactly we were doing for the upcoming round.				Our workgroup information binder was lacking slides with the detailed breakdown of contributions of various point, area, mobile sources to the total PM 2.5 levels. We only had a slide showing general breakdown. Detailed breakdown would have been helpful in hard copy rather than on just on the video recording of stakeholder meeting.		It may have been adequate to people more familiar with the SIP process. I am not.	
Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.	No	Yes		No		No	No	No	No
[Comment] Do you have any requests for additional information or suggestions for the presenters? Please describe.		If you send us things to view and prepare for, don't go over the same information in the meeting. It is unfair to those who prepare sufficiently to have to waste time going over it again.							
Have you already developed your constituent group?	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No	
[Number of Constituent] How many constituents have you involved?	10	3	3	10	10	8			
[Number of Meetings] How many times have you met with these constituents as a group?	2	2	2	1	5	2			
[Informed on PM2.5 issues] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	3	3	5	3	3	5			
[Technical expertise] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	3	1	5	4	3	3			
[Understanding of process] Please rate your constituent group's level of expertise in the following areas. (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	3	1	5	4	2	4			
[Rank 1] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by media	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest	Informed by personal or professional interest			
[Rank 2] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?		Informed by personal or professional interest		Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)	Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)			
[Rank 3] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?		Informed by/through discussions with me (i.e. workgroup member)		Informed by media	Informed by media	Informed by media			
[Rank 4] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?		Other		Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Informed using DAQ website or publications			
[Rank 5] What was the primary source of PM2.5 issue knowledge for your constituents?		Informed using DAQ website or publications			Other	Other			
Do you have any other comments or thoughts about the constituent-based approach being used in this process?	good plan								

Survey Question	WG Participant 1	WG Participant 2	WG Participant 3	WG Participant 4	WG Participant 5	WG Participant 6	WG Participant 7	WG Participant 8	WG Participant 9
[Rank 1] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Point	Point	Area	Mobile		Mobile	Mobile		
[Rank 2] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Area	Mobile		Area		Area	Area		
[Rank 3] Which type of emissions did your constituents rank as most important to target for reductions?	Mobile	Area		Point		Point	Point		
Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.	Yes	Yes	No	No		No	No		
[Comment] Did you need to educate your constituents about the difference between area, mobile, and point sources? Please explain.									
[Area] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min		60+ min			
[Mobile] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	30 - 60 min		60+ min			
[Point] Please indicate how much time was spent on each emission type during your discussions.	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min	0 - 30 min		0 - 30 min			
Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.	Yes	No	Yes	Yes		Yes			
[Comment] Were your constituents aware of any emission reduction strategies before your meeting? Please discuss.						They were already familiar with I/M Programs as a an emission reduction strategy.			
[Rank 1] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Informed by personal or professional interest	Independent research	EPA list provided to workgroups	Informed by personal or professional interest		EPA list provided to workgroups			
[Rank 2] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Other	Informed by personal or professional interest		Independent research		Informed by personal or professional interest			
[Rank 3] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Independent research	Informed using DAQ website or publications		EPA list provided to workgroups		Independent research			
[Rank 4] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	EPA list provided to workgroups	EPA list provided to workgroups		Informed using DAQ website or publications		Informed using DAQ website or publications			
[Rank 5] What materials were most important in identifying emission reduction strategies?	Informed using DAQ website or publications	Other				Other			
What was the group's number 1 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Eliminate VOCs	A biodiesel blend in the diesel fuel at pumps.	open burning	Manure Management Rules		I/M program, including gasoline vehicles and roadside smoke emission enforcement for diesel vehicles			
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5	5	4	3		3			

Survey Question	WG Participant 1	WG Participant 2	WG Participant 3	WG Participant 4	WG Participant 5	WG Participant 6	WG Participant 7	WG Participant 8	WG Participant 9
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5	5	5	3		4			
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5	5	3	2		3			
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	2	4	1		3			
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3	5	5	5		3			
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 1 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	5	5	3	5		3			
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 1 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5	4	5	5		4			
What was the group's number 2 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Natural Gas Fleet Conversion and Replacement	Decrease stop light waiting, and increase traffic flow efficiency.	enhanced I/M	Truck Stop Electrification		Solvent CTGs/Small point source controls on solvents			
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	4	3		2			
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		5	4	4		3			
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		3	4	4		2			
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		3	3	4		2			
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	2	4	4	5		5			
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 2 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	5	4	4	3		5			

Survey Question	WG Participant 1	WG Participant 2	WG Participant 3	WG Participant 4	WG Participant 5	WG Participant 6	WG Participant 7	WG Participant 8	WG Participant 9
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 2 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5	4	5	4		4			
What was the group's number 3 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Reduce Electricty and Natural Gas Consumption	Pave regularly traveled dirt roads.	Deisel I/M	Anti-Idling Program with Compliance and Enforcement		Commercial cooking/Residential wood burning stoves capture and control			
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	4	4	4		3			
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)		4	4	4		3			
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4	5	4	5		3			
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	4	3	2	2		3			
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3	4	5	5		2			
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 3 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	5	5	5	3		2			
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 3 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5	4	5	3		5			
What was the group's number 4 ranked emission reduction strategy?	Utility Portfolio Changes	Subsidize, lower rates, or offer free fares for public transit on red air days.	Locomotive upgrade	Telecommute on Red Days/Air Action Days		Adopt California standards for sale of small engines, i.e. snowblowers/ban sale of 2 cycle engines			
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	1	3	3	4		4			
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2	5	3	4		5			
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	5	3	4		5			

Survey Question	WG Participant 1	WG Participant 2	WG Participant 3	WG Participant 4	WG Participant 5	WG Participant 6	WG Participant 7	WG Participant 8	WG Participant 9
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2	4	1	4		4			
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3	4	4	5		2			
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 4 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	5	4	4	1		2			
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 4 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5	4	5	5		5			
What was the group's number 5 ranked emission reduction strategy?	High Efficiency Vehicle Parking	Sponsor, reward, or give a large grant to any person or institution that can find a practical way of methane sequestration from cattle and other sources.	smoking vehicle program	Restaurant Commercial Cooking Exhaust Controls		VMT Program			
[Economic Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	5	3	3	3		4			
[Technical Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2	3	4	4		4			
[Schedule Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	3	2	3	3		3			
[Political Feasibility] Please rate the feasibility of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals not feasible and 5 equals easy to implement)	2	3	1	3		5			
[Air Quality Benefit] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3	4	3	3		2			
[End User Impact] Please rate the Air Quality benefit and End User Impact of the group's number 5 emission reduction strategy. (1 equals low and 5 equal high)	3	4	3	3		2			
[Level of Consensus] How would you rate the level of consensus on strategy number 5 within your group? (1 equals low and 5 equals high)	5	3	5	3		5			
What time of day is best to meet?	Either	Afternoon	Either	Either		Morning	Morning		
Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes		

Survey Question	WG Participant 1	WG Participant 2	WG Participant 3	WG Participant 4	WG Participant 5	WG Participant 6	WG Participant 7	WG Participant 8	WG Participant 9
[Comment] Is three hours the most appropriate amount of time to spend at the next workgroup meeting? If not please indicate your preference.									
Do you have any comments or concerns that need to be addressed before the next workgroup meeting?	No		No	No		No	No		